

## REMARKS

These remarks are in reply to the Office Action dated January 7, 2007.

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a). Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7 have been amended. Claims 3, 4, and 6 have been cancelled. In addition, claims 24, 25, 28, and 29 have been amended, and claims 26, 27, and 29 have been cancelled. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a)

A. Amended claim 1 recites: "transforming the image data as it is received by selectively storing some of the *pixel components* in a memory for access by the display device and discarding other of the *pixel components*."<sup>1</sup> Claim 1 stands rejected on the ground that Figure 4 of the present application shows "discarding every other *pixel* 30 in a row." The rejection of claim 1 also cites Figure 2 of the present application. However, amended claim 1 does not recite pixels; it recites pixel components. Moreover, neither Figure 2 or Figure 4 discloses any aspect of storing data. Thus, every element claimed is not found in a single prior art reference and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) is not supported.

B. Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 depend from amended claim 1. Claims 2, 5, and 7-11 are not anticipated for the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated.

C. Claim 12 stands rejected on the ground that "since this claim is an apparatus claim corresponding to method claim 1, the discussion of claim 1 is applied here." MPEP 2131 provides that "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element is found . . . in a single prior art reference."<sup>2</sup> In addition, MPEP 2131 states "the elements must be arranged as required by the claim."<sup>3</sup> The rejection of claim 12 is not supported because: (1) each and every element is not found in a single reference; and (2) even if the reference disclosed all of the claimed elements, the reference does not describe the elements in the arrangement required by the claim.

According to the Office Action, Figure 10 of the present application shows "receiving image data from a data stream," and Figures 2 and 4 show

---

<sup>1</sup> Emphasis added.

<sup>2</sup> Quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*.

<sup>3</sup> Citing *In re Bond*.

"transforming the image data as it is received by selectively storing some of the image data in a memory . . . and discarding other of the image data."

First, claim 12 is directed to an apparatus and a transforming module is recited in claim 12. Neither Figures 2 or 4 disclose an apparatus. In particular, neither Figure 2 or Figure 4 discloses a module to receive data, a module to transform data, or a memory. Thus, each and every element claimed is not found in a single prior art reference. Accordingly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) cannot be maintained.

Second, even if Figure 10 shows "receiving image data from a data stream," Figure 10 does not show receiving the data stream arranged with "transforming the image data as it is received by selectively storing some of the image data in a memory . . . and discarding other of the image data." Rather, Figure 10 shows all of the image data in a data stream being stored in a memory. Further, Figure 4 merely depicts a scaling operation that may be performed on a frame before it is displayed on a display device. Figure 4 does not disclose any sort of structure for performing a scaling operation being arranged with a stream of data. Therefore, because the reference does not show the claimed elements arranged as required by claim 12, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) is improper.

D. Claims 13-23 depend from claim 12. Claims 13-23 are not anticipated for the same reasons that claim 12 is not anticipated.

In addition, claims 15 and 18 recite "wherein said data element is a pixel component." The Office Action cites Figure 2 of the present application for the rejection of claims 15 and 18. As mentioned, Figure 2 simply illustrates a raster scan pattern. Figure 2 does not disclose that a data element may be a pixel component. Applicant assumes that the Examiner intended to cite Figure 1 of the present application to show that a data element may be a pixel component. However, Figure 1 does not show the claimed elements arranged as required by claims 15 and 18. Thus, claims 15 and 18 are not anticipated because the reference fails to show the claimed elements in the required arrangement.

E. Amended claim 24 recites a step of "transforming the image data as it is received by selectively storing some of the *pixel components* in a memory for

access by the display device and discarding other of the *pixel components*."<sup>4</sup> Claim 24 stands rejected on the ground that Figure 11 of the present specification discloses "a CPU 84 (i.e., a computer) . . . for performing the steps in claim 1." However, Figure 11 does not show a CPU for selectively storing some and discarding other pixel components. "The CPU 84 writes a JPEG file to a FIFO."<sup>5</sup> Further, a dimensional transform circuit shown in Figure 11 does not selectively store some and discard other pixel components. On the contrary, the dimensional transform circuit fetches pixel components, assembles the components into pixels, and then performs a dimensional transformation:

"The dimensional transform circuit 88 reads pixel components from the component blocks stored in the line buffer 74. The dimensional transform circuit 88 does not read the pixel components sequentially, but reads them in raster sequence. The dimensional transform circuit 88 *assembles the pixel components into pixels* and, after performing any desired dimensional transform operations, such as cropping or scaling, sends the pixels to the color space conversion circuit 90."<sup>6</sup>

Plainly, there is no disclosure in Figure 11 of a CPU or transform circuit which dimensionally transforms image data by selectively storing some and discarding other pixel components.

Further, applicant assumes that the Examiner applies the discussion of claim 1 to claim 24. But Figures 2, 4, and 10 do not show a step of selectively storing some and discarding other pixel components. Figure 2 simply illustrates a raster scan pattern on a display device. Figure 4 depicts a scaling operation. Figure 10 shows all of a received data stream being stored in a memory. Accordingly, the reference does not show each and every element claimed. Moreover, the reference does not show the claimed elements arranged as required by claim 24. Plainly, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) is not appropriate.

F. Claims 25, 28, and 30-34 depend from claim 24. Claims 25, 28, and 30-34 are not anticipated for the same reasons that claim 24 is not anticipated.

---

<sup>4</sup> Emphasis added.

<sup>5</sup> Specification, page 10, lines 7-21.

<sup>6</sup> Specification, page 10, lines 7-21 (emphasis added).

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5, 7-25, 28, and 30-34 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectively requests that claims 1-2, 5, 7-25, 28, and 30-34 be allowed, and this application be passed to issue. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney, Richard A. Wilhelm (48,786), at 503-635-1187.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Watson/

Mark P. Watson

Registration No. 31,448

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Phone: (408) 952-6124  
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058  
Customer No. 20178

Date: March 23, 2007